

REMARKS

Claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are amended. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 27, 28, 31-33 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over newly-cited U.S. Patent 6,292,672 to Chavez, Jr. (hereafter Chavez) in view of U.S. Patent 5,657,382 to Tamagawa et al. (hereafter Tamagawa). The Office Action also rejects claims 29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chavez in view of Tamagawa and U.S. Patent 5,371,781 to Ardon. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 27 recites directing a call through a base station controller to a first wireless mobile terminal, ringing the first wireless mobile terminal, and receiving a request at the base station controller from a second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal in response to the ringing. Independent claim 27 also recites transferring the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request, wherein the transferring includes the base station controller assigning a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request, and transmitting information to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. The Office Action cites Chavez's col. 1, lines 10-36 for various features. However, this

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

cited section relates to features of wired telephone sets (as compared to wireless mobile terminals). Chavez even admits that the disclosed call pickup groups relate to wired telephone sets and not to wireless telephones. See Chavez's col. 1, lines 22-36. Subsequently, Chavez describes an apparatus/method for wireless terminals that differs from the description in col. 1, lines 10-21. In summary, Chavez's col. 1, lines 10-21 does not relate to the claimed features of a first wireless mobile terminal, a second wireless mobile terminal and a base station controller.

Chavez specifically relates to call pickup groups being based on a location within one of the cubicle areas 112-114. For example, FIG. 1 shows wireless terminals 107, 108 and 109 provided within a cubicle area 114. The wireless terminals determine which cubicle area they are in based on transmissions from a fixed unit located in each cubicle area. A fixed unit 116 within the cubicle area 114 may be assigned to a specific call pickup group. The fixed unit may be a controlling wireless terminal for controlling a transfer of data between wireless terminals within the corresponding cubicle area. See, for example, col. 2, lines 55-62.

Chavez does not teach or suggest receiving a request at the base station controller from a second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal in response to the ringing. Chavez utilizes fixed units 115, 116 and 117 that operate using infrared, which is a different medium than base stations 121, 122. Further, Chavez does not teach or suggest transferring the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request, wherein the transferring includes the base station controller assigning a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request.

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

The Office Action states that Chavez does not disclose transmitting information to the first (wireless) mobile terminal indicating a number of the second (wireless) mobile terminal that received the transferred call. The Office Action then cites Tamagawa's Abstract and col. 2, line 37-col. 3, line 12 for these missing features. However, as specifically described at Tamagawa's col. 3, lines 2-12, the call transfer information contains information such as a terminal dial number of the calling terminal and a time when the transfer occurred. See also Tamagawa's col. 5, lines 8-13 and col. 6, lines 13-18. Thus, Tamagawa does not teach or suggest transmitting information to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Chavez and Tamagawa do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 27. Ardon does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 27. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 32 recites a first wireless mobile terminal to ring in response to a call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal from a base station controller, and a second wireless mobile terminal to generate a request to pick up the call in response to the ringing. Independent claim 32 also recites a base station controller that receives the request from the second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal, that assigns a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request and that transfers the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request. Independent claim 32 further recites that the base station controller transmits information to the

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Chavez, Tamagawa and Ardon do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 32. More specifically, Chavez does not teach or suggest a base controller that receives the request from the second wireless mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first wireless mobile terminal, that assigns a wireless traffic channel to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request and that transfers the call to the second wireless mobile terminal in response to the request. Tamagawa also does not suggest that the base station controller transmits information to the first wireless mobile terminal indicating a number of the second wireless mobile terminal that received the transferred call. Thus, independent claim 32 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 27 and 32 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Reply to Office Action dated December 13, 2007

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: March 5, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610